Protection of endangered animal species

1876. SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether unhindered large scale poaching in reserved forests has driven tigers and other highly endangered animal species into extinction during the last few years;

(b) if so, the details, with allocation made, received from donor agencies and spent during the last five years on agencies entrusted with the responsibility to protect wildlife, area-wise and year-wise;

(c) the action taken to fix responsibilities for such grave dereliction of duty;

(d) whether in view of the unreliability of the data generated indigenously, it is proposed to invite a UN Agency to conduct tiger census in the country; and

(e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI NAMO NARAIN MEENA): (a) While instances of poaching have come to light from different States at times, no report of animal species going into extinction has been received.

(b) Details of Central assistance provided to States under on-going Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Ministry of Environment and Forests for conservation of wildlife, are given in the enclosed Statement (*See* below).

(c) The Government of India provides funding support and directives for field implementation of schemes pertaining to wildlife conservation by States. Since day to day management of field units is done by States, fixing responsibility for dereliction of duty falls within the domain of State Governments.

(d) and (e) The Project Tiger Directorate in the Ministry of Environment and Forests has developed and enhanced methodology for conducting the All India estimation of tiger, large carnivores, ungulates, habitat status evaluation and monitoring with inputs from the Wildlife Institute of India. The methodology involves forest beat level primary data collection by forest staff and data collectors for computing indices of relative abundance of

tiger and other wild animals apart from evaluation of habitat status, followed by density computation using sampling in the GLS domain. The Process would be overseen by a panel of national and international, independent experts.

Statement

Protection of endangered animal species

1. Statement showing release of Funds to States under the Scheme "Development of National parks and Sanctuaries" during last five years

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UTs	2000-01	2001-02	2002-2003	2003-04	2004-05
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	A & N Islands	50.00	25.59	20.75	—	69.40
2.	Andhra Pradesh	186.07	88.595	82.725	89.30856	71.70
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	121.12	160.465	105.035	151.046	111.086
4.	Assam	317.205	70.55	162.135	93.68	213.45
5.	Bihar	21.02	4.52	00	24.65	—
6.	Chandigarh	—	18.40	14.00	—	—
7.	Chhattisgarh	—	36.94	92.025	295.93469	277.29
8.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	—	6.01	15.25	—	20.00
9.	Goa	10.50	89.98	Nil	36.45607	37.50
10.	Gujarat	65.27	127.20	90.365	52.14	223.93
11.	Haryana	28.35	15.64	18.75	24.84	45.10
12.	Himachal Pradesh	165.30	111.235	93.853	168.9605	343.52
13.	Jammu & Kashmir	—	26.00	99.90	138.82492	63.20
14.	Jharkhand	—	Nil	29.89	54.6228	77.50
15.	Karnataka	307.18	388.26	599.017	693.9609	546.24
16.	Kerala	102.62	81.50	198.978	188.371	238.78879
17.	Madhya Pradesh	182.195	99.38	196.332	344.35594	268.455
18.	Maharashtra	90.96	153.368	168.20	165.24596	108.05

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Manipur	41.784	26.81	64.50	57.80	110.588
20.	Meghalaya	66.36	27.95	40.25	93.07	84.82
21.	Mizoram	102.31	128.55	235.60	231.836	315.0412
22.	Nagaland	31.85	43.13	107.84	42.70	32.32
23.	Orissa	3.50	70.265	82.57	187.25	370.27
24.	Punjab	26.39	29.60	Nil	—	—
25.	Rajasthan	116.00	73.00	366.273	214.819	246.62
26.	Sikkim	97.45	30.45	132.76	108.92	74.40
27.	Tamil Nadu	89.83	75.23	136.11	139.76	158.75
28.	Tripura	21.90	46.41	101.88	245.26484	49.125
29.	Uttar Pradesh	144.60	79.815	137.36	164.37	287.53
30.	Uttaranchal	—	38.13	77.985	96.39	69.20
31.	West Bengal	90.22	180.945	23.67	214.165	317.24
	TOTAL :	2479.984	2353.918	3694.00	4318.74218	4780.22449

2. Statement showing release of Funds to Tiger Reserves under the Project Tiger Scheme during last five years

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UTs	2000-01	2001-02	2002-2003	2003-04	2004-05
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	45.00	21.00	21.10	22.89	15.00
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	32.607	82.76	35.875	68.75	35.00
3.	Assam	156.10	46.00	65.70	75.00	—
4.	Bihar	87.077	50.00	25.00	50.00	85.00
5.	Chhattisgarh	—	35.00	32.48	80.25	27.75
6.	Jharkhand	—	75.65	18.00	35.99	72.5005
7.	Karnataka	193.36	181.434	289.56	269.32	486.292

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Kerala	50.00	50.00	63.75	120.68	105.75
9.	Madhya Pradesh	434.247	472.18	786.44	1103.414	609.93
10.	Maharashtra	167.931	209.231	621.79	228.45	255.953
11.	Mizoram	27.58	20.495	98.32	67.56	94.34
12.	Orissa	83.31	126.81	32.88	151.91	116.4395
13.	Rajasthan	299.705	170.319	294.92	158.33	79.00
14.	Tamil Nadu	60.315	16.00	125.00	35.00	80.00
15.	Uttar Pradesh	181.655	67.40	32.75	173.585	175.215
16.	Uttaranchal	—	181.825	168.00	200.91	200.12
17.	West Bengal	98.18	142.176	168.33	225.17	325.49
18.	Meghalaya	1.50	—	—	—	—
	TOTAL:	1918.567	1948.255	2879.895	3067.209	2763.78

3. Statement showing release of Funds to States under Project Elephant scheme during last five years

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UTs	2000-01	2001-02	2002-2003	2003-04	2004-05
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	46.30	31.00	50.00	55.00	48.09
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	89.81	56.00	52.00	61.00	59.00
3.	Assam	45.00	94.5	116.00	134.100	130.00
4.	Jharkhand	5.00	22.688	45.00	93.00	105.96
5.	Karnataka	51.00	81.00	93.00	149.660	186.22
6.	Kerala	66.05	82.00	111.88	188.280	167.40
7.	Meghalaya	35.73	30.00	41.00	64.00	70.00
8.	Nagaland	35.17	72.13	49.00	42.00	29.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Orissa	29.75	102.03	108.39	116.100	137.96
10.	Tamil Nadu	50.00	40.00	71.26	117.00	84.00
11.	Uttaranchal	100.00	125.14	107.00	129.00	138.90
12.	West Bengal	79.04	95.00	86.47	119.950	148.54
13.	Manipur	1.00	—	—	—	0.00
14.	Tripura	2.00	1.00	3.00	16.00	17.00
15.	Mizoram	1.00	—	5.00	—	0.00
16.	Uttar Pradesh	—	—	—	—	12.00
	TOTAL:	636.85	832.49	939.00	1285.09	1333.98

4. Statement showing release of funds to States under India-Eco-Development Project during last five years

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UTs	2000-01	2001-02	2002-2003	2003-04	2004-05
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	West Bengal	459.39	848.63	217.38	186.29	10.17
2.	Jharkhand	125.00	325.67	252.39	195.84	—
3.	Gujarat	658.73	300.00	840.58	272.75	253.91
4.	Kerala	561.81	704.41	65.01	100.66	69.49
5.	Rajasthan	531.28	227.50	564.91	296.61	2.12
6.	Madhya Pradesh	322.94	643.79	539.21	146.37	170.00
7.	Karnataka	425.85	950.00	1042.33	0.00	0.00
	TOTAL:	3085.00	4000.00	3521.81	1198.52	505.69

5. Statement showing release of funds to States under Beneficiary Oriented Tribal Development Project during last two years

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	State	2000-01	2001-02
1.	Karnataka	64.65	100.00
2.	Madhya Pradesh	200.00	300.00
3.	Maharashtra	46.00	—
4.	Orissa	—	—
	TOTAL:	310.65	400.00

*During Xth Plan BOTD Scheme is merged with Project Tiger Scheme.

6. Statement showing release of funds to States under Eco-Development during last two years

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	State	2000-01	2001-02
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	33.548	69.595
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	31.83	45.153
3.	Assam	45.51	43.81
4.	Bihar	28.99	33.86
5.	Chhattisgarh	—	24.70
6.	Gujarat	26.22	32.56
7.	Himachal Pradesh	66.00	131.346
8.	Jharkhand	—	12.56
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	—	—
10.	Karnataka	209.02	339.346
11.	Kerala	153.439	138.27
12.	Madhya Pradesh	126.53	231.974

1	2	3	4
13.	Maharashtra	27.00	46.40
14.	Manipur	21.445	9.15
15.	Meghalaya	21.52	17.106
16.	Mizoram	118.05	226.83
17.	Nagaland	23.25	28.45
18.	Orissa	56.16	42.60
19.	Punjab	—	12.272
20.	Rajasthan	—	80.20
21.	Sikkim	29.60	26.225
22.	Tamil Nadu	6.30	6.38
23.	Tripura	20.00	44.346
24.	Uttaranchal	—	82.00
25.	Uttar Pradesh	113.74	118.99
26.	West Bengal	153.00	121.953
	TOTAL:	1311.152	1966.07

*During Xth Plan Eco-Development is merged with Project Tiger Scheme.

Plastic waste

1877. SHRIMATI BIMBA RAIKAR: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether India generates around 7250 tonnes of plastic waste including pet bottles, snack/gutka pouches, etc. every day;

(b) whether 60 per cent of this plastic waste is recycled into inferior products which are hazardous to health;

(c) whether the rest 40 per cent is tossed around to choke sewers and environment; and

(d) whether Government would enact an uniform law for use of bio-degradable plastics?